

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11529

there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000.

(3) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of section 19, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000.

(4) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of section 14, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$5,500,000.

(5) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually not to exceed \$500,000 for the expenses of the Commission.

(6) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 for the services and expenses of the Mediator and the assistants and consultants retained by him: *Provided*, That, any contrary provision of law notwithstanding, until such time as funds are appropriated and made available pursuant to this authorization, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is authorized to provide for the services and expenses of the Mediator from any other appropriated funds available to him and to reimburse such appropriations when funds are appropriated pursuant to this authorization, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations provided in this Act shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 26. Section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes", approved April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 47; 25 U.S.C. 640) is repealed effective close of business December 31, 1974.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for final settlement of the conflicting rights and interests of the Hopi and Navajo Tribes to and in lands lying within the joint use area of the reservation established by the Executive order of December 16, 1882, and lands lying within the reservation created by the Act of June 14, 1904, and for other purposes."

Mr. MEEDS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman himself extend in the Record an explanation of these amendments?

Mr. MEEDS. I will.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I was not allowed to record my vote on H.R. 5385, the Surface Transportation Act of 1974. I placed my card in the appropriate box, and my name was not recorded as voting at the time.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 17597, EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 17597, to provide a program of emergency unemployment compensation, along with any separate, dissenting and/or additional views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1468 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17234) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MURPHY of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1468 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 17234, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. House Resolution 1468 provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

H.R. 17234 states the sense of Congress that no aid should be given to any nation in the Middle East which denies its citizens the right to emigrate. It earmarks \$100 million in military grant aid for Israel; \$250 million each in security

supporting assistance to Israel and Egypt; and \$200 million in military credit sales to Israel.

H.R. 17234 repeals the \$150 million ceiling on U.S. military aid and credit sales to Latin America, but it retains the present \$40 million ceiling for Africa while adding Presidential authority to waive the limitation.

H.R. 17234 also limits economic and military assistance to India in fiscal year 1975 to \$50 million. It also establishes a prohibition on further military assistance or sales to Turkey until the President certifies to the Congress that a "substantial good faith effort" is being made by Turkey toward achieving a settlement on Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1468 in order that we may discuss, debate, and pass H.R. 17234.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) has ably explained the provisions of the resolution. This is the Foreign Assistance Act. Whatever our view on foreign aid might be, I see no reason for not debating the bill on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the adoption of the resolution so we can get down to debate on the foreign assistance bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 322, nays 58, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 667]

YEAS—322

Abdnor	Blatnik	Burton, Phillip
Abzug	Boggs	Butler
Adams	Boland	Carter
Addabbo	Bolling	Casey, Tex.
Alexander	Bowen	Cederberg
Anderson, Ill.	Brademas	Chamberlain
Andrews	Bray	Chappell
N. Dak.	Breaux	Chisholm
Annunzio	Breckinridge	Clark
Archer	Brooks	Clausen,
Arends	Broomfield	Don H.
Armstrong	Brotzman	Clay
Ashley	Brown, Calif.	Cleveland
Aspin	Broyhill, N.C.	Cohen
Badillo	Broyhill, Va.	Collier
Baker	Buchanan	Collins, Ill.
Beard	Burgener	Conable
Bell	Burke, Calif.	Conte
Bergland	Burke, Fla.	Conyers
Blaggi	Burke, Mass.	Corman
Blester	Burleson, Tex.	Cotter
Bingham	Burlison, Mo.	Coughlin
Blackburn	Burton, John	Crane

H 11530

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

Cronin
Culver
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.
Daniels
Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
DeLaaney
Dellenback
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Drinan
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Flood
Flowers
Foley
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Froehlich
Fulton
Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Gillman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Guyer
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Hastings
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heinz
Helstoski
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Hosmer
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier

Kazen
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Litton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClary
McCloskey
McCormack
McEwen
McKay
McKinney
Madden
Madigan
Mahon
Mallory
Mann
Martin, N.C.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvisinsky
Michel
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Powell, Ohio
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pritchard
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Roe

Roncallo, Wyo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schroeder
Sebelius
Seiberling
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Stark
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerin
Vander Veen
Vanik
Veysey
Waggonner
Waldie
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wylder
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.O.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—58

Anderson,
Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Ashbrook
Bafalis
Bauman
Bennett
Bevill
Brinkley
Byron
Camp
Cochran
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Denholm

Dent
Dorn
Flynt
Frey
Gaydos
Ginn
Gross
Gunter
Haley
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Henderson
Huber
Landgrebe
Landrum
Lott
McCollister

Martin, Nebr.
Mathis, Ga.
Miller
Montgomery
Nichols
Pike
Poage
Rarick
Rogers
Roussetot
Runnels
Shipley
Snyder
Spence
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens

Stuckey
Symms
Thone
Vigorito

Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.

Wyllie
Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—54

Barrett
Brasco
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Carey, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio
Clancy
Clawson, Del.
Dellums
Dulski
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fisher
Ford
Gialmo
Goldwater
Grasso
Gray

Griffiths
Hanna
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Hollifield
Howard
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Kuykendall
Lukens
McDade
McFall
McSpadden
Macdonald
Maraziti
Mathias, Calif.

Millford
Mills
Minshall, Ohio
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Hara
Passman
Podell
Preyer
Reid
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Schneebell
Taylor, Mo.
Thornton
Tiernan
Traxler
Vander Jagt
Wyman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Dulski.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. Grasso.
Mr. Ford with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Hollifield.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Carney of Ohio with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. McDade with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Millford with Mr. Mills.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Preyer with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Thornton with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Traxler with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Tiernan.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Wyman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17234) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17234, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, now that the second session of the 93d Congress is drawing to a close, we once again turn our attention to a program which has been an important part of our foreign policy for the past quarter of a century.

We all know it as the foreign aid program.

During the past 11 months, this body has considered more than 1,500 bills and resolutions.

Most—nearly all—of those measures have dealt with our national defense and economy—with programs important to the security and well-being of our people.

We have debated and voted on bills relating to our domestic employment and unemployment—health and education—transportation—social security—veterans benefits—and many other subjects.

Those programs directly affect the lives of 213 million American people.

They account for 98 percent of our \$300 billion national budget.

They deserve—and have received—our first attention.

Now, however, the time has come to look again beyond our borders—at the larger world in which our country must survive and prosper.

It is a world which is very troubled today—and which faces more difficult problems than we Americans do.

It is a world in which peace and security are still very elusive—and in which violence, and danger of war, are always present.

And it is a world which is suffering from massive inflation—high unemployment—and widespread starvation.

Before this year is finished, thousands more will die of hunger—and many millions will greet the new year with empty stomachs—and little or no hope of ever earning a decent livelihood.

The United States is a part of that larger world.

We exist in it—and we cannot divorce ourselves from it.

As the oil crisis has shown, our security and our economic progress are affected by it.

And so is our national spirit—the spirit which has made us a great Nation—and made us try to bring peace and better life to those who need our help.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we will debate this afternoon is important to our relations with the world outside our borders.

It is also important to the future of our own country.

Our committee has spent more than 5 months working on this bill.

We have heard many witnesses—from the Government and from the private sector—and we have spent a long time marking it up.

In the end, we have cut \$609,400,000 from the President's request—and recommended a bill authorizing \$2,643,300,000 for our international security—mili-

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11531

tary sales—and development assistance programs in fiscal 1975.

Briefly, the major provisions of H.R. 17234 are as follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST

Title I, the "Middle East peace package," is probably the most urgent portion of the bill. Action on it is required to support efforts being made to prevent another Arab-Israeli conflict which could bring about a new oil embargo and threaten world peace.

Specifically, the Middle East package provides \$550 million for Israel; \$250 million for Egypt; \$202 million for Jordan; and \$100 million for a special requirements fund.

These figures include economic aid, military assistance, and military sales credits.

In recommending these amounts, our committee modified the Executive request in these respects:

First, we reduced the \$300 million programmed for Israel for military sales by \$100 million, and provided that same amount in the form of grant military aid;

The committee also increased security supporting assistance for Israel raising the total amount of aid authorized for that country \$200 million above the Executive request.

Second, we earmarked \$6 million of the special requirements funds for the U.N. Relief and Works Agency which cares for the Palestinian refugees, to help offset a part of its deficit;

Third, we prohibited the use of the fund for the financing of any nuclear plants for Egypt or Israel;

And, finally, we reaffirmed the sense of the Congress about withholding aid from countries which do not allow their citizens the right of emigration.

Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of the President and of the Secretary of State, this "Middle East peace package" is necessary to keep some measure of stability in that area, and to get the parties concerned moving on reconstruction projects.

I want to add that there is no program under this title for any assistance to Arab oil exporters.

INDOCHINA AID

For the countries of Indochina, the committee recommends \$573,400,000 for fiscal year 1975—a cut of \$366,400,000 in the administration's request.

The committee has given this part of the foreign aid program very close attention and recommended a sharp reduction of nearly 40 percent below the Executive request.

While we believe that the Executive's request was too high, the committee agreed that a reasonable level of aid was justified.

The funds authorized here will help reconstruction efforts and refugee programs in South Vietnam, Laos and—hopefully—enable Cambodia to survive until it can work out a peace settlement.

In the past, Congress has been critical of the President's authority to transfer foreign aid funds from one program to another.

Our bill limits aid to South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to the authority provided in title II.

The President would be permitted to use other foreign aid funds in Indochina only by using a waiver which would be subject to a concurrent resolution veto by Congress.

The committee also approved an amendment which would shift military aid to South Vietnam from the DOD budget to the foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1976.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The bill also provides \$226,700,000 for development assistance and other international economic aid programs—a reduction from the administration's request of about \$63 million.

As Members may recall, last year's foreign aid bill contained a fundamental reform in the U.S. aid program.

The purpose of that reform was to stop aid programs which could be better handled by the private sector and international institutions—and to direct U.S. development assistance toward the poor majority in the developing countries.

As the World Food Conference in Rome recently underlined, the most desperate need in this area is for food aid.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the bulk of the development assistance funds—over \$180 million—be used to help the poorest countries to increase their food production.

In a related area, the committee cut the contingency fund by \$25 million and prohibited the use of those funds to pay for gifts to foreign government officials; \$15 million of the \$25 million cut from the contingency fund is earmarked for emergency famine and disaster relief.

WORLDWIDE SECURITY ASSISTANCE

In the area of worldwide security assistance—other than the funds programmed for the Middle East and Indochina—the bill provides \$427 million for grant military aid, \$175 million for military sales, and \$7.5 million for supporting assistance.

The committee cut these categories of aid by \$190 million.

This part of the bill also places ceilings on military aid to Korea and to Chile and prohibits military aid to Turkey until that country makes a "good faith" effort to reach a peaceful settlement on Cyprus.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the committee approved several provisions which strengthen congressional control over foreign aid spending and give Congress improved oversight of our foreign policy in general.

Among those are amendments which: Give the Congress veto power—by concurrent resolution—over any transfer of development funds to military aid;

Limit economic and military assistance to India to \$50 million in fiscal year 1975; and

For the first time, put strong restrictions on the use of the Central Intelligence Agency for operations in foreign countries which go beyond collection of intelligence.

These are the major provisions of the bill before you. The Foreign Affairs Committee approved this legislation by a voice vote and the individual provisions

which were voted in were passed by bipartisan majorities.

Mr. Chairman, as the first speaker on this bill, I will be the first to admit that the bill is not perfect—and that it involves a large outlay of money.

At the same time, I would like my colleagues to remember that most of this money will be spent right here in the United States—creating jobs—and paying for the products of our factories and of our farmers.

I would also urge my colleagues to consider these three points:

First, that peace is a lot cheaper than war.

This applies especially to the Middle East package which accounts for more than 40 percent of the funds in this bill.

Second, that while we are still providing a lot of aid to Asia, our expenditures in that region have gone down by more than 90 percent in recent years—and will go down even further if peace prevails in Indochina.

And, finally, that most of the development money in this bill will go to fight starvation and hunger—by helping the less developed countries increase their production of food, and manage their population growth.

I cannot see how we—the strongest and the largest consuming nation in the world—can deny them this help.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that our domestic situation puts many of us under heavy pressure to vote against this bill.

I hope, however, that we will not do this.

I hope that, instead, the House will take a long-range view of what is really in the interest of our Nation and support this legislation.

With all of its imperfections—and the bill certainly does not satisfy everyone here—this is the best bill that our committee could produce this year.

And it is clearly in our national interest.

I urge that the bill be approved.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the Delegate from Puerto Rico.

Mr. BENITEZ. I thank the gentleman from yielding.

I wish to refer to section 34 of the bill entitled "Involvement of Puerto Rico in the Caribbean Development Bank." I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, as I understand it, the purpose of this section is, threefold:

First, to clear up all possible questions concerning the propriety of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico if it so chooses to apply for and become in its own right a member of the Caribbean Development Bank. This objective is covered by the authorizing language in section A.

Second, the bill intends to make it perfectly clear that whatever commitments Puerto Rico makes are to be made and to be accepted on the basis of Puerto Rico's own responsibility and will not involve in any way any legal or other responsibility on the part of the U.S. Government. This is covered in section B.

Third, the bill also wishes to make clear that the United States is not at-

tempting to use Puerto Rico as a sort of left-handed way of withdrawing funds contributed by U.S. banks. Section C endeavors to make this objective clear.

The government of Puerto Rico agrees fully with these reservations and has no interest whatsoever in taking advantage in any way of its special and fruitful relationship with the United States in dealing with its neighbors in the Caribbean region.

Given the overall purpose as well as the basic coincidence of views as to the desirability of participation, it would indeed be unfortunate if the language used to provide safeguards and to clarify purposes were to be misinterpreted and twisted around so as to negate those very objectives we jointly wish to achieve. For instance, some of this language and some of the committee report language might be misread to imply that Puerto Rico is to be precluded from participating in policymaking discussions when moneys which contain, in whole or in part, U.S. funds are involved, and since moneys coming from the United States would not be kept in separate accounts, but would form part of a general fund, such interpretation might result in negating any participation on fiscal matters. Under such terms, Puerto Rico would be handicapped to such an extent as to make it useless to participate in such enterprises.

Now, therefore, I wish to ask the distinguished floor manager of this bill what is the correct interpretation to be attached to these provisions.

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to clarify the issues raised. Our intention is to facilitate Puerto Rico's participation in the activities of the Caribbean Development Bank. We think such participation will be good for the Bank, good for Puerto Rico, and good for the United States. We think there must be a full understanding between Puerto Rico and the State Department. We appreciate that once there is such general understanding with the State Department, and once Puerto Rico enters the Caribbean Development Bank, then Puerto Rico must operate on its own. It is not to be regarded by anyone as an agent of the United States but exclusively as its own agent. Furthermore, we think it is to everybody's advantage that no scintilla of suspicion exists anywhere as to the intention of Puerto Rico or of the United States that Federal funds are not to be diverted toward Puerto Rico via the Caribbean Development Bank. We wish Puerto Rico the best of success.

Does this answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. BENITEZ. Yes it does, thank you very much. Given these clarifications, I wish to state that we fully support the proposed section 34.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman thinks this is not a perfect bill and I find myself in solemn agreement with him on that score. But I wonder

why we do not have something at least approaching a perfect bill. Today is December 10, and I believe we convened on January 20 of this year. Is it because there has been a great deal of foot dragging and in-and-out consideration of this bill for the reason that it bestows another \$2.6 billion or \$2.7 billion on assorted foreigners around the world? Or has the administration not been sure that the votes are available to pass this bill? What is the reason that we get it at this late date?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He works hard and he attended the hearings. Of course, he knows the bill did not come up from downtown until the middle of May. Since then we have had recesses in the summer, in August, also over Memorial Day and the Fourth of July. We had long hearings and we were 5 weeks in the markup. Now that we have moved into open sessions on the markups, they are much longer, as the gentleman knows, because the Members like to perform in front of an audience, so the markup took a longer time. We finally finished the markup and got the bill out of the committee by a voice vote just 2 days before we went home for the election recess. Then, of course, we came back and I went to the Rules Committee and we got a rule. It was not a matter of deliberate delays but hard work of the committee and the many complex issues which arose during the past 6 months. The gentleman knows that as a member of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Is it here now because we are approaching the Christmas season and this Government would like to tell the rest of the world that it has a nice \$2.6 billion or \$2.7 billion Christmas present for them?

Mr. MORGAN. They might have that feeling. It has never been my purpose to give out Christmas presents around Christmas with other than my own money. I like to spend my own money when I give Christmas presents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, what is the rationale behind giving India any military money?

Mr. MORGAN. It is not military money. This is economic aid solely. There is no military money for India.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The limitation is set at \$50 million for economic and military aid. Is the gentleman telling us there is no military aid?

Mr. MORGAN. It is all economic aid. The President requested \$75 million and there were some amendments offered in the committee to eliminate it all, but it finally was reduced to \$50 million, but it is economic aid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion in the committee centered around fertilizer; did it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Not for India but for South Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. No, for India.

Mr. MORGAN. As far as I know I do not think there is any fertilizer for India. But there could be some since the \$50 million is intended primarily to help them increase food production.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that was \$75 million, reduced to \$50 million now in the bill, for fertilizer for India?

Mr. MORGAN. I think it is mostly for grain and other food production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman explain how much increase the committee voted for Israel over what the administration requested and why?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not the author of the Israel aid amendments. I am not sure any of the Members present in the Chamber were.

Israel never received any military grant in assistance except at the end of last year, after the Yom Kippur war, when the Congress provided \$2.2 billion in military aid—part of it on grant basis at the discretion of the President. The fiscal year 1975 program called for \$300 million in military sales and \$50 million in supporting assistance. Many Members felt they should have some grant assistance and that is the reason the \$100 million in sales was changed to \$100 million in grant assistance. Other Members thought the supporting assistance for Israel was too small and they wanted some balance in the allocations between Israel, Jordan, and Egypt—and there was an amendment offered to increase the supporting assistance authorization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did that total about \$2.2 billion?

Mr. MORGAN. \$250 million. The \$2.2 billion was approved last year, right after the Yom Kippur war, to preserve some balance in the Middle East.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On page 24 there is \$3.28 billion. Does that mean they are behind in that amount?

Mr. MORGAN. No. I think they are pretty well up on their payments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What does that current account deficit mean?

Mr. MORGAN. What page is that on?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The top of page 24, Israel's current account deficit. It says it is expected to exceed \$3.28 billion by the end of 1974.

Mr. MORGAN. That is their trade—export and import account for the year. That is the country's current deficit.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. That is the result of the \$2.2 billion that was given to Israel in the supplementary appropriation and, as I understand, it is not the current

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11533

amount, but it is the amount flowing from the United States overall.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not in arrears, that is just the total deficit they owe.

Mr. WOLFF. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We are talking about the humanitarian aid in this bill. It is a \$2.2 billion bill and the way I add it up we get only \$250 million for humanitarian aid and the rest goes for military sales; is that it?

Mr. MORGAN. There is \$1,486 million in the bill for various types of economic assistance, \$405 million for military sales, and \$745 million for military aid. Large part of the economic aid—disaster aid, refugee aid, postwar reconstruction in Indochina and the Middle East, and food aid—can be classified as humanitarian aid.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) has already indicated why this bill (H.R. 17234) is important. I agree wholeheartedly with what he said. At the outset of my own remarks, I should like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN). He has been a good chairman and he has guided us through many difficult situations with considerable skill.

After 22 years of participation in the deliberations of this body, I would like to pay tribute to a man who have taken responsibility and handled it well. I would like to rise here today also—for the last time—in defense of foreign aid and in support of this bill (H.R. 17234).

In that connection, I should like to read a letter which I received from the President of the United States yesterday. I shall ask permission when we go into the House to have the entire letter inserted. It begins as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 9, 1974.

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PETER: Recently, I completed my first visit abroad as President of the United States. In my talks with the leaders of each country visited, I was again impressed with the vital responsibility which the United States carries for building peace in the world and with the need for a strong, active American diplomacy to achieve this objective. It is clear that the continuity and strength of our political, economic, and social policies depends upon our purposeful and wise involvement in the international community. More than that, it is clear to me that we must fashion a role of leadership—in our own interest and that of others—if the possibilities for conflict between nations are not to preempt the possibilities of cooperation.

In dealing with the urgent needs of our world—security needs, economic needs, emergency relief, development needs—we have a proven and highly flexible tool, namely foreign assistance. More than any other device, it can help to shape peaceful relationships in a world still plagued by hostilities, social unrest, critical shortages and turmoil. United States assistance is identified with humanitarian goals, with commonality of security interests and with the moral obligation of our democracy to support the political and economic interests of many of the world's peoples.

Foreign assistance can be a means of assuring not only stability but also progress. In both cases it can help assure peace. We risk much in reducing or restricting foreign assistance. We risk the moderation of our adversaries and the self-reliance of our friends. We risk a world which others shape to their own liking and to the possible detriment of our interests.

Two areas illustrate our dilemma and our opportunity very clearly: the Middle East and Southeast Asia.

In both areas our assistance programs support our peacemaking role. In both our aid will help keep alive the hope for negotiation. In both our aid will contribute to the security of countries whose needs are great and friendship firm. In both our past commitments are being tested in the eyes of a world which is gauging our reliability for the future. In both we are looking not just for a temporary truce but for reassuring social and economic progress.

In a broader context, nothing has demonstrated our interdependence with other countries and their reliance on American leadership and cooperation more than the shortages we are facing in food and energy. For many countries, without the help of our foreign assistance programs, there would be starvation and sickness.

We must not neglect the needs of the very poor. We must not ignore the victims of famine and disasters. We must not slow the building of institutions of development in which cooperation—rather than rivalry—can spur planning and development.

This does not mean that we can be extravagant; quite the opposite is true. We must measure the resources which we apply to the attainment of foreign policy and national security objectives with the greatest care. We must not be generous at the expense of our own economy, or our critical domestic programs. But we must have legislation which will provide adequate resources to insure that United States interests abroad are protected, and which will also provide the President with sufficient flexibility to use those resources to the best advantage for America. To tie the hands of the President in countering unforeseen circumstances or in dealing with emergencies would thwart the Constitution we are all sworn to uphold.

I believe a continuing battle between the Executive and the Legislative Branches over the direction of our efforts in foreign policy and national security would be very detrimental to the national good. We must again look at our role as Americans, and work together to solve the problems that threaten our interests throughout the world and at home.

I know we share a deep concern for the protection of our national interests and our national security, and working closely together we can provide the tools in the Foreign Assistance Act to meet the challenges we face throughout the world.

I wanted you to have these thoughts as you prepare to consider this year's foreign aid authorization.

I hope that I can count on your support and that of your colleagues in moving toward early enactment of this most vital piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

JERRY FORD.

This is an important bill, indeed, in my opinion an essential one.

I agree with the chairman of our committee that H.R. 17234 is by no means a perfect bill; it contains many provisions and restrictions which I personally feel are objectionable and unwise. Many of them I opposed during the committee debate, but in many instances, by views did not prevail. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) has clearly

explained what is in this bill and its importance, and I shall not attempt to cover that ground again. Nor do I intend to emphasize my own reservations about the drastic cuts which have been approved by the committee in its collective wisdom.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, I should like to contribute to this debate a positive note. My intention is to point out what I believe is essential in the bill, and why I earnestly believe it should be passed in its present imperfect form. As I look back on more than two decades of controversy on this issue, I feel it is especially important to consider past, present, and future alternatives. What, we must ask ourselves, might the world be like today—even in its delicate state of 1974—if the United States had repudiated its international responsibilities following World War II? What would Europe be like today without the Marshall plan? Or the developing nations without Point Four and its successor programs of technical cooperation and development assistance? These programs, I need not remind my colleagues, have been supported by both major political parties in the Congress under the leadership of six presidents over a period of more than 25 years.

The cost of these programs, as many of our colleagues are quick to point out, has been considerable. Some, unfortunately, have been characterized by waste and mismanagement. But cost must be measured not only in terms of results but also against the probable cost of inaction. Inaction by the Western democracies in the thirties led to the costliest and most destructive war in the "history of human conflict." And the cost of turning our backs on the developing world today could have equally damaging consequences.

Let us consider the results of our foreign aid programs: From my vantage point since 1961 as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, helping to oversee foreign aid authorizations during a decade characterized as the "decade of development," I can say unequivocally that the less developed nations, despite the greatest obstacles—drought, floods, natural calamities, civil strife, and turmoil—have achieved more than even the most optimistic among us had thought possible when I took my seat in Congress in 1953.

Despite allegations to the contrary, Mr. Chairman, the international development effort is working. In the last decade—the 1960's—the less developed economies as a whole grew at an average rate of 5.6 percent. This exceeds—I repeat, exceeds—the rate of growth in the industrialized countries during comparable periods in their history.

On the agricultural front, the introduction of high-yield varieties of wheat, corn and rice, and the massive quantities of commercial fertilizer through the U.S. foreign aid program has increased food production in the less developed countries by an encouraging 36 percent. And let us always remember, Mr. Chairman, that an increase in local food production is always cheaper in the long run than is the shipment of emergency food supplies directly from the United

H 11534

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

States. Again, we must consider the cost of failing to do what is necessary.

In industrial terms, manufacturing output in the developing countries has grown an astonishing 92 percent. As a notable example, the rapid growth of industry in Korea boosted that country's gross national production to a record 9-percent average for the decade—almost double the growth of the 1950's. Taiwan is another example of what a vigorous self-help effort can accomplish—when supplemented by outside assistance. There are many other impressive examples of this trend—too numerous to mention and analyze at this time.

But let me turn from the past record of accomplishment to the present business at hand—and the challenges which lie ahead. We all recognize, I believe, the precarious nature of the world's economy. We are increasingly conscious of the significance of the major shifts of assets from the industrialized to the oil-producing nations. We cannot help but be aware of the dangers inherent in the tenuous balance still being preserved in the Middle East. If we are truly concerned about the cost, let us consider for a moment the cost to the United States alone—not to mention our NATO allies—which resulted from last year's Yom Kippur war and the subsequently imposed Arab oil boycott. Even more important, let us consider also the possible effects of another disastrous conflagration.

I do not for a moment contend that we can "buy" peace in the Middle East through the simple expedient of a generous commitment to foreign assistance. At this somber stage—when lines appear to be hardening on both sides, particularly over the Palestinian question—it is difficult even to predict whether another outbreak of hostilities can be avoided at all. What can be stated with assurance, however, is that every possible effort must be made to avoid such a calamity. In this connection I commend President Ford and Secretary Kissinger for their determination to walk the last mile down the road in search of a peaceful and equitable solution. It is absolutely essential that such efforts be continued and encouraged despite the obvious obstacles that lie ahead.

The bill before us today contains a highly significant Middle East "package." This package, however, I repeat will not, by and of itself, secure peace in that part of the world. It does, however, provide our Government and our policymakers with a most useful negotiating tool which could strengthen the case for a peaceful option. This is a balanced package, I should add, which offers \$250 million in security supporting assistance to Egypt and Israel alike. It also provides for a Middle East Special Requirements Fund, which can be used as circumstances require to make negotiations a more attractive prospect for potential belligerents. Israel, moreover, is authorized \$100 million in MAP assistance and \$200 million in FMS credit sales. These amounts will contribute to Israel's own defense at a time when her position is critical—indeed, many believe, seriously threatened.

This investment in a peaceful resolution of differences—which I repeat may

or may not be attainable—is a modest one indeed, if we consider some of the alternatives. The potential cost of renewed hostilities, involving the risk of renewed boycotts and economic retaliation by the oil-producing Arab nations, renewed demands for Israel's resupply and the dangers of great power involvement, is astronomic. Again, the economic risks of passing this authorization bill are miniscule when compared to the risks of doing nothing.

This bill also attempts to alleviate, to some small degree, the most compelling problems of food shortage and famine and excessive population growth. Again, I think, we must ask ourselves how long we can afford to ignore the basic needs of the economically disadvantaged two-thirds of the world who by the year 2000 will make up three-quarters of the global population. And what will be the consequences of inaction for ourselves?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say a few words about security assistance, which is a key element of this legislation. Military spending, I recognize, is under mounting attack these days and is becoming an increasingly popular target for severe cuts. Many, in fact, view security assistance in the same vein, but the analogy is inaccurate and misleading. On the contrary, there is no better way to add to the burdens and the costs of maintaining a large defense establishment than to curtail severely our investment in international security assistance, which is the cornerstone of our strategic defense policy. That policy has been based on the long-held, and I believe reasonable, assumption that by assisting other countries of strategic importance to us—countries which are seriously committed to their own defense and independence—we are protecting our own interests in the area. And this can be done at far less cost than would be the case if we were obliged to carry this burden directly.

I recognize, of course, that the definition of what constitutes "strategic importance" has been called into question in recent years. Some critics have argued that the ultimate tragedy of Vietnam has been the overcommitment of U.S. forces and resources to one limited area of the world. The charge is not without substance. With the benefit of hindsight, I am personally convinced that the direct takeover of all military operations in Vietnam by U.S. forces was an error of judgment. As I stated last March on the floor of this Chamber, I bear some responsibility for that decision on the basis of my voting record.

The point is, however, that the tremendous sacrifice of U.S. lives and treasure have been made—for better or worse. Now that U.S. troops have been withdrawn and a deescalation of the fighting has been brought about, it would be the height of folly to cut off supplies of needed equipment and ammunition at a time when the Vietnamese, not the Americans, are carrying the major defense burden. For let it be clearly understood that if we do less than is required, we shall be contributing not to peace in Vietnam, but to the likelihood of renewed and protracted conflict.

In global terms, moreover, another

reality must be understood: there is a vast area, extending roughly from the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean to the far reaches of the Pacific, which is highly unstable politically and potentially explosive. A recourse to arms is always a possibility to be reckoned with—as is the sudden eruption of local or regional conflicts into worldwide crises in which the U.S. interest could be seriously and adversely affected.

For this reason, I have long felt it to be dangerous in the extreme for Congress to attempt to legislate, on a country-by-country basis, the level of assistance to be provided. It is risky to tinker with our existing global defense posture without devising a substitute overall coordinated plan which will not disrupt the tenuous balance which still prevails. This is a risk which the Congress has not yet been willing or equipped to undertake.

Nevertheless, the argument is made by a number of our colleagues that the security assistance program to often has had the effect of subsidizing authoritarian and repressive regimes around the world to America's detriment.

It is, of course, inevitable that as a world power, with worldwide responsibilities, we shall at times find ourselves, in the process of defending our own interests, assisting some authoritarian governments. Unfortunately, if we look at the state of the world today—as it exists rather than as we might wish it existed—we find only a handful of real "democracies," as Americans would define that term. Outside of the Western Hemisphere and Western Europe, democratic governments are at a premium. That is true in most of the Near East and South Asia, in Africa, the Far East, and Latin America. There are some obvious and impressive exceptions to this general rule, which are easily identifiable for being just that—exceptions.

This leads me to some final comments about the Thieu government in South Vietnam, which has been the focus of much exaggerated and, in my opinion, unwarranted criticism in recent months. No one argues that the Republic of Vietnam is a perfect, unblemished democracy—which provides its citizens with all of the constitutional protections which we are fortunate enough to enjoy. However, if we look at the total, worldwide picture—in which authoritarian governments predominate—I believe the South Vietnamese do not compare unfavorably—especially for a people which has no tradition of parliamentary rule and which has been massively engaged in domestic conflict for over two decades.

If the GVN is as "repressive" as has been alleged, the question arises as to why there is so much evidence of dissent, which has been covered in such painstaking detail by the international news media. Why do we hear of large demonstrations, of petitions, and of stormy, free-swinging parliamentary sessions? Are these, we might ask, manifestations of a totalitarian dictatorship? We might also ask ourselves why, since the de facto partition of Vietnam in 1954-55, some 800,000 inhabitants of the North fled to the South? And why even today are continuing defections occurring from the

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11535

Communist side—with only a trickle moving in the other direction?

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the contemporary mood is one of disillusionment and frustration—frustration over past military involvements and over present inflation and recession. It is, however, a dangerous illusion to suppose that we can have economic recovery at home amid chaos and instability abroad.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by appealing to all Members, whether or not they have supported this type of legislation in the past—and I extend that appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to consider the overriding issues at stake, rather than the imperfections of the bill before us. And I ask them to ponder also the available alternatives.

For the United States shares one intractable problem with every other nation on this planet: We cannot "stop the world and get off." History has taught us that major responsibilities may be postponed for a time, but they can never be completely avoided. The question remains: Postponement for how long—and at what cost? This is the question which I leave future Congresses to answer. And I wish for future Members the patience of Job, the vision of Moses, and the wisdom of Solomon.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 17234.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today during debate on the foreign aid bill to announce that I shall offer an amendment on page 30, after line 12, when we proceed under the 5-minute rule, for the purpose of establishing the sense of Congress that the President shall enter into negotiations with each country receiving assistance under the Foreign Aid Act of 1961 which is in default for more than 90 days prior to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, my Subcommittee on Foreign Operations has for 4 years conducted hearings on the status of the repayment of delinquent foreign debts. Although some progress has been made, Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion, which is shared by many Members of this body, that the Department of State lacks the necessary determination and dedication to properly represent the best interests of the taxpayers of America.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that more is needed and that my amendment will take the next step toward the collection of delinquent foreign debts by expressing the sense of Congress that the President shall enter into negotiations with each country which is delinquent in the payment of its debts for more than 90 days.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his proposed amendment. The gentleman knows

that for a long time I have attempted to collect foreign debts owed this Nation and I have circulated a House resolution that has more than 235 cosponsors.

One point that I note, however, is that in the gentleman's amendment, he excludes the debts owed to us as a result of World War I. Those debts are still legal and binding, and they amount to well over \$12 billion. That money would come in mighty handy today here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman would include in his amendment World War I debts as well.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, but for the possibility of a point of order on this amendment, they would have been included. I think the gentleman will have an opportunity later to cross that bridge.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to join in paying tribute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) for his excellent work in this field on the Committee on Government Operations.

This is something that I think we have not really paid much attention to. I think that if we take into account what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) has mentioned, as far as World War I debts are concerned, we are talking about possibly something in excess of \$60 billion owed to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I pay tribute to the gentleman. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I hope the House will support the gentleman when he offers his amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I believe the programs herein authorized to be funded to be in the national interest of the United States, and, therefore, in the interest of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to identify myself with the remarks of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN). I think the statesmanship of his remarks spoke well enough for all of us and gave us the reasons why we ought to pass this bill.

I ought not let this occasion pass without saying a word of appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman himself on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in the Congress of the United States. The gentleman, as most of us know, measures up, in the highest and fullest degree, to his distinguished family name and tradition. He has given signal leadership in this House and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has been a rich privilege to work with him and to

recognize that leadership. The Congress and the country will be poorer by the gentleman's retirement from the House at the end of this current session of Congress.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would salute the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and express my gratitude for his leadership in the Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

(Mr. WHALEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17234, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974.

Mr. Chairman, the measure which we are considering today bears no resemblance to the foreign assistance request which was introduced in June of this year and assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee made extensive changes in the bill. Actually there were 65 amendments proposed during the committee's deliberations; 51 of these were adopted.

These amendments fall into three distinct categories. The first category changes the authorized spending limitations from those proposed in the original bill. These fall into seven areas.

First, the authorization of last year for development assistance was reduced by \$75 million. Second, last year's authorization for population planning and health was increased by the committee by \$20 million in view of the very serious concerns in this area. Third, last year's authorization for the United Nations' Relief and Works Agency was increased by \$6 million. Fourth, Mr. Chairman, the funds for postwar Indochina reconstruction were reduced from \$939 million to \$573 million, or a cut of \$366 million.

Fifth, security supporting assistance was increased by \$200 million, from \$385 million to \$585 million.

I would point out that this \$200 million increase, all of it is earmarked for Israel.

Sixth, the military assistance program was reduced by \$240 million, from the \$985 million originally requested to \$745 million. Also, of this \$745 million, \$100 million is earmarked for Israel.

Seventh, foreign military sales are reduced by \$150 million, from \$555 million to \$405 million.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a reduction of \$609 million from the \$3.2 billion originally requested by the administration.

The second category of amendments imposes restrictions upon the ability of the executive branch, to transfer funds from one category to another.

A word of explanation here is in order. In past years the administration often has taken funds which have been requested for one country and assigned them to other countries. Also, funds which had been authorized for economic development have been transferred to military uses.

There are four amendments in this area. One would limit to a 10-percent deviation from the backup request the

H 11536

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

amount of funds authorized for any particular country.

The second amendment prohibits, as the Chairman pointed out, the transfer of economic development funds for military use.

Third, the President, under the provisions of this bill, is required to report all military sales involving a total of \$25 million or more for any specific item of equipment.

Fourth, as the Chairman also pointed out, this bill prohibits the transfer of nuclear reactors as a part of the assistance provided to the Middle East under title I of the bill.

The third category of amendments deals with human rights. A general statement concerning human rights was adopted by the committee, and I refer my colleagues to page 14 of this bill for the text of this amendment. Also, two specific human rights amendments were adopted, one limiting aid to Chile, the other imposing restrictions upon military assistance provided to Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I think the bill that emerged from the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a substantial improvement upon the measure that was originally introduced in June of this year.

I urge the Members of this body to approve H.R. 17234, and I do so for four reasons:

First, this bill certainly contributes to the foreign policy initiatives undertaken by the executive branch, particularly so in the case of the Middle East peace-keeping effort which took place after the October war.

Second, H.R. 17234 lives up to the admonition of President Ford who urged Congress to "bite the bullet."

It does represent a substantial reduction in the authorization requested which, as I pointed out, was cut from \$3.2 billion to \$2.6 billion.

Third, this bill gives Congress much greater control over foreign aid expenditures than in the past. As I have indicated, the Congress now has control over transfer of funds from one country to another, over the transfer of funds from economic development to military purposes.

The fourth reason that I support this measure, and urge my colleagues to do likewise, is that it takes a very strong position in the field of human rights.

We have heard some comments this afternoon about a "perfect" bill. I suppose for the gentleman from Iowa, a "perfect" bill would be no bill at all.

Certainly I find some imperfections in the bill myself, and I know that other members of the committee do, also. Let me point out that the administration fought many of the amendments which were adopted by the committee, but the administration has indicated that they want a bill, and they have urged that this body approve the bill adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Chairman, again, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me, and I would like to have a comment from someone on this, which is one of the things that disturbs me, and I guess I am the only one that it disturbs, and that is that we seem to be sending arms to both sides to be used in the next conflict in the Middle East. The committee has increased by \$200 million, as the chairman stated, the administration's request for funds available to Israel. I really have not heard the justification for this increase. I would like to hear somebody discuss this from the point of view of providing arms in a volatile situation to both sides, because it seems to be that if things should go wrong they could be used against each other, and that we are providing aid to our friends on both sides to kill our friends on both sides.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that we are giving no direct military arms, this is \$250 million in reconstruction financing.

Mr. WHALEN. This also involves a discussion of our Middle East policy, and certainly this issue cannot be discussed in the time remaining to me. I think we would all agree that it would be extremely desirable if there were no frictions in the Middle East, that there were no war there in the past, and that all countries in the Middle East agreed to a very minimum level of arms. But the unfortunate situation is that Russia has supplied the Arab States with arms, and we have responded by supplying not only Israel, but certain other Arab States which we count among our friends. I dislike this myself, but I think that we must keep a balance of arms in the Middle East. Unfortunately, we are responding to a fact of life over which at this point we have no control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, it is also true, as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, that some of the \$250 million in aid is going to Egypt, and some of it is going to Jordan, and is nonmilitary, but let me point out that this is significant economic assistance which will free other resources for providing arms for those countries. We are providing arms to Jordan and to Saudi Arabia. I really believe that there has to be some better alternative than that of arming both sides in these possible conflicts.

I do not know whether anyone else agrees with me on that or not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would the gentleman in the well agree that this aid particularly the aid to Egypt and the other aid to other Arab States, is all part and parcel of the efforts that the administration has been making and which were extraordinarily successful last January, and later on, in achieving some motion toward peace in the Middle East?

This is all part of that effort, and an integral part of that effort, as Secretary of State Kissinger has made clear, and one that he feels would contribute to his efforts to bring peace to that area.

Mr. WHALEN. I would certainly agree, and the chairman of the committee in his presentation brought that out also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHALEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time, and I again yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I keep asking this question, and this concerns me also, but I do not seem to receive an answer to it: and that is if this bill is supposedly in support of the administration's position, why did the committee increase the amount of arms aid to Israel by \$200 million?

Mr. WHALEN. I believe the chairman answered that question.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, there is also increased aid from the Soviet Union that has gone to Syria. Even greater now than even has been given Egypt in the past. The Soviet Union up to the present time has put some \$10 billion of military assistance into that area. Since the war, they had completely resupplied not only Egypt but Syria to such an extent that Syria today is a much more formidable military machine than they were prior to the war.

Mr. WHALEN. There is one other point, also. The administration requested \$100 million in military credit sales for Israel. We switched that out of that category into the military assistance program. This was, as pointed out by the chairman, the first time, really, that Israel has received an outright grant of military equipment. They purchased it in the past, but in view of the October War which so depleted their resources, it was the feeling of the committee that we should forego military credit sales in favor of the grant. A commensurate reduction was then made in the total military credit sales.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The major reason for the increase over the executive request is that the original executive request came prior to the October war, and the committee considered the bill after the October war. The original executive request of \$50 million was actually made up prior to that war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

That cannot be right. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) said it came up in May of this year; the war was last year.

Mr. HAMILTON. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, the original

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11537

executive request was set before that war, and it was not changed, and it came to the Congress with expectation that the Congress would increase it. The Executive accepted the increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, 6 months behind is a normal matter of routine? If the war was fought in September 1973, the request came up in May of this year? The request was prepared in October of the year before?

Mr. HAMILTON. It is correct the bill was not submitted to us until June, but the Executive, in anticipation of the increase by Congress, just left the security supporting assistance amount at \$50 million, which was the figure that they had initially set prior to the October war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to join in complimenting the chairman of the committee. It has been truly a pleasure to work with him in the long process of bringing this bill to the floor. I should like to join, too, in complimenting the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN). He will be missed in the committee and in the House. Also, I want to say that many of us are very grateful to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) for the work that he did in bringing together a group again and again to try to agree on certain amendments that would improve the bill.

I should like to direct my remarks at this point to those Members who may feel tempted to vote against H.R. 17234 because they feel this bill authorizes too much military assistance to repressive regimes.

I will say to those Members that I will join with them in efforts to cut that assistance or to restrict it in some way. I did so in the committee, and I will do so again here on the floor.

But I would urge them, if any of those efforts fail, not to vote against the bill, because if this bill is defeated, the alternative would be a continuing resolution and if we have such a continuing resolution, we will fail to benefit from the many salutary changes in the aid programs that are achieved in this legislation.

Some of these have been mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN). For example, if we defeat this bill, we will lose the opportunity to increase by more than 60 percent the developmental assistance for agriculture that is authorized in this bill, and there is nothing we need more in this world today than greater agricultural production.

We face a worldwide food crisis. We are going to be called upon to respond to that crisis in terms of assistance in the form of grain, and we will no doubt do so. But this is the most inefficient way to respond to the crisis. A far better way is to respond by helping other nations to grow more food, and this bill will pro-

vide the authority to increase that program.

Also this bill will provide for an increase in our population control assistance programs, which are also needed in the food crisis as part of the equation. And this is something else we would not be able to do if we had to operate under a continuing resolution.

Then, too, we have in this bill increases for assistance to Israel, which have been mentioned and which are essential in the light of Israel's economic situation today. If we are ever to have peace in the Middle East, and I pray that we will, we have got to make it perfectly clear that the United States is going to give Israel the wherewithal to survive economically and militarily. Otherwise there is no incentive for the Arabs to make an agreement.

There are also in this bill certain restrictions on aid which will be lost if we defeat this bill and go on a continuing resolution. One is that for the first time Congress will have some control over the military cash sales program, which has grown enormously in recent years. This bill provides us with a handle on that type of assistance which we have not had before.

The bill also provides some restraint on the operations of the CIA, and there are other valuable restrictions in the bill.

As a result of the excellent work done in the committee by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), the bill also prohibits the kinds of transfers of funds that the administration has used in the past to divert from the purposes the Congress wanted pursued to other purposes; that practice will be restrained under this legislation. This too would be lost if H.R. 17234 is defeated.

As I have said, I agree with those Members who feel there is too much money in this bill for military assistance to repressive regimes. But, having done what we can to reduce that assistance, I would plead with them then to help pass a bill that the world needs and which is in the interest of the United States.

Let me now go over some of these points in greater detail.

The principal purpose of H.R. 17234 is to authorize appropriations totaling \$2,643.3 million for fiscal 1975 for international security assistance, economic assistance, and military credit sales programs. The bill, while not perfect, is responsible and responsive. It provides the administration with funds to execute our aid programs in a manner consistent with our national security. But it also makes clear to the administration the conviction of the Congress and the American people that the American foreign aid program must reflect the traditional American commitment to human rights and improving the well-being of the world's poor and must not be used to prop up repressive regimes.

The American people expect the Congress to legislate new directions to our international assistance programs. To fail to pass this aid bill would be to fail in this task.

If H.R. 17234 were to be defeated, we would then no doubt pass a continuing

resolution, which would permit a continuation of the administration's present aid policies. In contrast, H.R. 17234 would modify important aspects of the administration's general policies and revise funding levels of programs to reflect a belief that America should increase developmental and humanitarian aid and place limits on military aid.

The Congress faces two alternatives—we can pass this bill or we can rely on a continuing resolution to fund our aid programs. The latter, a continuing resolution, is by far less desirable.

A continuing resolution would not permit us to be responsive to the legitimate needs of our friends and allies for increased development assistance and economic aid.

First, it would not permit an increase of over 50 percent in the authorization for agriculture, rural development and nutrition for fiscal year 1975. The foreign aid bill would increase the authorization for this purpose from \$291 million to \$471.3 million, an increase of \$180.3 million.

Agriculture and rural development constitute an area of the highest priority. The less developed world's need for aid for agricultural production is now more urgent than ever. Many of the less developed nations have been severely affected by the sudden and drastic increases in prices for fertilizer, fuel, food, and other commodities. Some face the prospect of massive starvation deaths because of food shortfalls. There is no doubt that these nations will need food aid, nor that we will provide it. However, if we can, without neglecting our own agricultural production, contribute to increased food production abroad, we are helping ourselves in the process. There is also convincing evidence that increases in food production in the developing countries are less costly to achieve than they are here.

It, therefore, makes humanitarian and economic sense for Congress to do all it can to increase the food producing capacity of the hungry nations so that they can better meet their own needs in the future.

Second, a continuing resolution would not permit an increase in funding for population control programs, which are an integral part of economic development and social progress. Unrestrained population growth only exacerbates the current food scarcity crisis in many parts of the world. H.R. 17234, by authorizing an additional \$20 million for programs designed to control population growth, will help us also to meet the current food crisis.

Third, and as importantly, a continuing resolution would not permit the increases in security supporting and grant military assistance to Israel which the Foreign Affairs Committee believes are necessary to assist Israel in meeting its financial burdens and legitimate security needs. In contrast, the foreign aid bill would increase the funding for security supporting assistance to Israel from \$50 million to \$250 million and transfer \$100 million from the administration's proposed foreign military credit sales to Israel to grant aid for Israel. Without

H 11538

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

passage of the foreign aid bill, Israel would be hard-pressed to meet its increasing financial burden alone, and its well-being and security might be impaired.

In addition to thwarting the will of Congress to respond to the legitimate needs of our friends and allies for development and economic assistance, the defeat of this bill and reliance on a continuing resolution would thwart the will of Congress to set new policy directions for American aid programs. The foreign aid bill contains important restrictive provisions which would not be operative under a continuing resolution. These include: First, restrictions on aid to nations which deny free emigration or free expression of human rights within their borders; second, restrictions on executive branch authority to conclude large cash sales of military equipment without informing Congress; third, restrictions on the nature of CIA operations; and fourth, restrictions on the transfer of funds from productive developmental uses such as agriculture to nonproductive uses such as political support.

The provisions related to human rights would alert the President and foreign countries. The American commitment to human rights conditions our decisions on allocation of foreign aid funds, and that a nation's violation of its citizens' human rights, including the freedom of emigration, may result in severe limitation or denial of American aid. I think the Foreign Affairs Committee actions reducing the administration's request for aid to Chile and Korea are good steps in that direction. I would support even further reduction in aid to Korea. They will alert those nations and others, such as Syria, to our active concern with human rights and to our determination to predicate our foreign aid in large part on their respect for their citizen's rights.

The provision requiring the President to submit to Congress quarterly estimates of foreign military sales and to report to Congress 20 legislative days before any foreign military sale of \$25 million or more, and providing for a congressional veto of such sales would enable the Congress for the first time to exercise effective oversight and control over the amount of defense articles sold for cash each year. This oversight and control is important because of the impact that such sales often have on our relations with the purchasing country and its neighbors. Present reporting procedures require only yearly estimates of cash sales. These have proven inaccurate. For example, the original Department of Defense estimates for cash sales in fiscal year 1974 was \$3.6 billion. Actual cash sales totaled \$5.9 billion. The \$2.3 difference clearly demonstrates the need for more frequent reporting so that Congress may monitor the sales program more closely. The enactment of the provision requiring reports prior to large sales will give the Congress the opportunity to study the circumstances surrounding each major sale and to assess their foreign policy impact, and if called for, Congress would lack this authority under a continuing resolution.

The bill would also establish policy guidelines for our intelligence activities,

and an oversight role for the foreign affairs committees of the House and Senate. It would thereby assure that our intelligence activities are in consonance with both our legitimate national security requirements and our overall foreign policy interests. It would also insure that Congress is informed and consulted about covert and other activities which may have important foreign policy and national security implications.

Finally, the bill would prohibit transfer of development assistance funds to any country which receives security supporting assistance, Indochina aid, or assistance under the Middle East peace package or vice versa. This would strengthen congressional control over the use of foreign aid funds, and assure that the will of Congress is followed. It would preclude a repeat of such actions as the unilateral executive branch decision in fiscal year 1974 to give South Vietnam a \$50 million development loan for what appeared to be political rather than developmental reasons.

In conclusion, I would urge you to support the foreign aid bill, as reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The bill will enable us to take many important steps toward modifying the direction of our foreign aid policies and strengthening congressional control and oversight.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT).

(Mr. DU PONT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Foreign Assistance Act. We worked very hard in committee to pare down the request of the administration, but I do want to take this time to be somewhat critical of one section of the bill, and that is the exorbitant amount of aid that is in the bill for Arab nations in the Middle East. I offered an amendment in committee to try to do something about this and it was soundly defeated, so perhaps I should not be taking time on the floor, but I do think we added a tremendous amount of money in an effort to buy something. Perhaps we are trying to buy peace, perhaps we are trying to buy friends, or perhaps we are trying to avert another war, but look at what we have done.

We have started a foreign aid program to Egypt and to Syria, a brand new program that was not there before. And how have we bid into this new poker game? We have bid in at a very high level—\$100 million in discretionary funds and \$250 million for Egypt.

The Members know as well as I do that foreign assistance programs grow. They do not shrink. Next year the request will be up. I think it is far too much money to be spending in that area of the world.

If we look at the summary table of this legislation we will see where the money is being spent, and we will find the committee did a very prudent job in pruning back Indochina aid, in pruning back the foreign military aid, but when it comes to security supporting assistance last year \$112 million was appropriated, and the administration came in and asked for \$385 million, but the Foreign

Affairs Committee in a burst of generosity appropriated \$585 million. Most of that excess amount is going to Jordan and Syria and Egypt. I will be frank to say I think we are throwing away in those specific areas the taxpayers' money. It is too much money.

I think that particular section of the bill is a poor one, but aside from that I give my wholehearted support to the bill and I plan to vote for it on final passage on the floor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in considering the foreign aid bill we need to distinguish between two questions:

How do we meet aid needs and commitments this year?

In what direction do we move over the longer run?

On the first question, the only answer that I can come up with is to pass the bill now before us. There is no time to develop a better alternative, given the present advanced date, and to reject the bill outright would be a tragic default on our responsibilities, given the diverse needs that it addresses and the modest scale on which it proposes to meet them—needs which have been sharply aggravated, I may say, by the recent large increase in oil, wheat, and fertilizer prices.

But for the longer term I find the direction represented by this bill unsatisfactory. For several reasons:

It is a bilateral aid program, and it seems to me that the time for bilateral aid is long since passed, given the wealth of other potential donors;

It still reflects the thinking of the immediate postwar period, in which the distinction between donors and recipients was sharply drawn by tragic circumstances. What we need now is not so much hand-me-downs from rich to poor countries as cooperative effort by both rich and poor countries to meet common problems;

It is geared, in good part, to cold war objectives that have little to do with the economic problems that now must concern us increasingly. Trying to deal with both security and economic problems in one program in apt to mean that neither is effectively addressed; and

It has become so encrusted over the years with legislative restrictions and bureaucratic limitations as to lack the flexibility that is required to deal with new emerging problems.

For these and other reasons, I believe that we should mark 1975 as the last year in which the Congress will try to meet the needs for overseas capital transfers through this type of program. Bilateral foreign aid has served us well, but, it is time to move on to other means—at least as far as the nonsecurity problems that we must meet abroad are concerned.

In part, of course, we have done this—in supporting the World Bank, regional development banks, and the U.N. development program—and I hope that

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11539

this will continue. In particular, I hope that the Congress will permit the United States to contribute to the World Bank's soft loan window, the International Development Association, on a scale that will enable this businesslike operation to go forward on the scale that other donors favor and are prepared to support.

But these organizations would be the first to admit that what they are doing is not enough—and cannot be enough. We face new and mounting economic problems overseas. They must be met. Foreign aid of the sort that we are debating today is not an effective way of doing so. But inaction will not solve these problems either. We need to take new bearings.

Foreign aid rested on the concept that rich countries should share their bounty with the poor. The rich were in good shape the poor were in bad shape and transferring resources from the one to the other would help to right the situation. But this is no longer an accurate description of the situation. Both rich and poor countries are now in deep trouble, and because of the same problems: food, energy, population, and environment. The way to deal with these problems is not by handouts to help the poor but by joint efforts to solve the problems.

Of these, the most urgent is food. It is important to the developing countries because they are not getting enough to eat. It is important to the developed countries because worldwide food shortages mean rising prices, which spur inflation. The answer to both developed and developing countries' problems is more production. Only increased production will assure adequate availability of foodstuffs and stable prices. Since the market in food is a world market, increased production anywhere will help. But, particularly, we need more production in the developing countries, where the opportunities for increase are greatest.

Enlarged food production requires capital investment—in farm machinery, irrigation, fertilizer production, and much else. It requires technical skills. It requires sensible pricing and other policies. All this is primarily the responsibility of the countries in which production takes place. But international cooperation is also required. This need was recognized at the recent World Food Conference, where various proposals were made for joint effort to this end. Particularly important was the Egyptian proposal for a world food fund, to which not only the traditional donor nations but others—including the oil-exporting countries—would contribute and whose resources would be used to support investments to increase food production which could not be financed through other means. In the wake of that Conference, this and other proposals for joint action are being urgently studied.

I submit that dedicating the sums that we have traditionally appropriated for bilateral foreign economic aid to support an international world food effort would be a more useful way to spend these sums in the future. This option is

not now before us: Activating an international world food efforts would be a more useful way to spend these sums in the future. This option is not now before us: Activating an international food effort will take time. Hopefully, by next year such an effort will be sufficiently advanced so that we could move in this direction. In doing so, we would be helping not only to avert starvation abroad but also to meet very serious problems at home: Unless we are to adopt export controls, which would invite instant retaliation by others, our food availabilities and prices will continue to be determined by the worldwide balance between food supply and demand. By helping to right that balance, we help ourselves.

The same principle is relevant in regard to energy. Here, too, there is a worldwide market between sellers and buyers. Here, too, the worldwide shortage—however artificially induced—hurts us. Here, too, development of new energy sources would serve our interests and that of others. As I understand Secretary Kissinger's recent speech, it calls for just such development, in order to improve the global balance between energy supply and demand and thus set the stage for effective bargaining about prices with the oil exporting countries. While this development will be primarily the concern of countries in which it takes place, international cooperation will again be required, to insure that scarce capital and skills go where they can be most useful. It will be in our interest to contribute to such an effort. If our skills and resources can be put to good use in developing new energy sources in poor nations, the effort will be felt tangibly and beneficially here at home.

Population and environment are other relevant areas. If opportunities to make a contribution here arise, they should be pursued. In none of these fields, however, are the problems as urgent and important, or proposals and prospects for international programs to which we and others could contribute on a large scale so far advanced, as in the case of food.

I propose, therefore, that we now do two things:

Approve this year's aid bill, to permit an orderly phasing down of bilateral economic aid; and

Make clear our sense that a new approach will be needed next year—an approach founded on the principle not of charity from rich to poor but of joint effort by all countries—rich and poor, alike—to meet the global food problem. We should make clear that we favor U.S. leadership in bringing about a world food fund and that, if others contribute on the scale that their resources permit, we believe that the United States should do the same. And we should make evident that we favor this not as an ad hoc action but as a basic move away from the concept of bilateral economic aid to that of common international effort in meeting common problems—a shift that may well have relevance to the problems of energy, population, and environment, as well as food.

To this end, I propose that the executive and legislative branches establish next year a joint commission to study

how such a shift might best be accomplished—how bilateral economic aid can be phased out without disrupting present problems and commitments, and how the United States can take its place in new international effort to meet the emerging food and perhaps other problems, to which all would contribute and from which all would benefit. The time has come to put relations between industrial and developing countries on a new basis, which fully integrates the efforts of both to meet common problems and the duty of both to share common responsibilities.

Change is the law of life. International economic needs and circumstances have changed greatly in recent years. Now our response must also change. This means not cosmetic facelifting in the present program, but a basic shift of goals and philosophy. In acting on this year's bill, we must give unmistakable evidence not only of our willingness to meet our current commitments but also of our determination to bring that change about.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his comments, and say that I agree with him wholeheartedly that there is a need for far greater efforts than have been made thus far, especially in the fields of food, energy, and population. I feel there is a need for greater international cooperation, but I wonder whether we should be so harsh on the value of bilateral aid; that arguments that others should be doing more can be used for an argument against bilateral aid.

I see no early or easy alternative to substantial bilateral aid as a way of coping with the immediate problem. I see no possibility that multilateral aid would be developed to cope with the consequences of our involvement in Southeast Asia. I see no ready international interest in providing substantial funds for the Middle East, so in many ways I think our bilateral aid should not be denigrated as somehow outmoded.

I think it is very up to date, both in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response to the proposal that I have offered, and I think in offering it in the form that I did, namely, suggesting a joint commission composed of members of both the executive and the legislative branches, I was conceding in advance, perhaps, a part of his argument. The kind of shift I envisage will not be easy to attain.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER).

(Mr. PREYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, around the world, and especially in the Mideast, the Soviet

H 11540

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

Union and its friends are making great gains at American expense. The most striking sign of Soviet success has been the blow to Secretary Kissinger's plan for a political settlement in the Mideast by the acceptance of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian cause.

At the same time, the Communists are gaining in Europe. Except for Greece, the countries of the northern Mediterranean shore all have disciplined Communist movements now knocking at the gates of power.

The billions in oil money flowing to the oil producing countries is threatening the world's financial structure and a worldwide economic depression. The Cyprus situation threatens the loss of the southern flank of NATO: If we lose our bases in Greece and Turkey, the Mediterranean could become a Russian sea, thus endangering our ability to supply Israel in the event of another war there.

Is this the time when Congress will at last kill the foreign aid program? It is hard to conceive of a worse moment for such action.

The purpose of the foreign aid program is to influence the future in other lands. As such it is a vital instrument of foreign policy. Its purpose is not to do good to all mankind, nor to establish democratic governments in every country. The benefits of foreign aid—like foreign policy itself—are not readily apparent and are long range in effect; the mistakes are immediately and highly visible.

Much of the criticism of foreign aid is justified. The program should evolve and respond to this criticism, and I think this is happening. Americans are uncertain about the basic purpose of influencing the future in other lands. There are questions about whether we have the taste or talent for it. Furthermore, foreign aid presents a fat political target of opportunity, especially in a period of domestic recession. Attacking foreign aid for "pouring money down a rathole" is a sure-fire applause getter at any rally back in one's district. No one in this Chamber will gain any votes by voting for foreign aid. Yet if we recognize that the world is changing faster than our policy can cope with, and that we are struggling to adjust to it, surely we must support the foreign aid bill at this time until better alternatives can be developed. We can give only two cheers for foreign aid; the applause for it is that of one hand-clapping. We can recognize that we must break away from foreign aid as a habit, as something to be routinely approved, and that we must continue to explore alternatives. But with our foreign policy losing ground to the Soviet Union, surely this is not the time to kill foreign aid.

It is taking the easy way out to vote against this bill and cite the perilous state of our own economy as reason enough to keep our money at home. It is easy for that matter to contend that our sufferings in Vietnam should have taught us to back away from all "foreign entanglements."

The simple truth, however, is that we are entangled on this small planet and

our economic problems neither began solely within this country nor will we find the solutions by turning inward.

The familiar arguments that foreign aid dollars spent in the United States help our economy and that we have a moral responsibility to help the poor remain valid. Even more important today are the questions of our own national interests in an increasingly tense world. The United States-Soviet détente must not cloud our vision. In the Middle East, in Indochina, and throughout the Third World violence and despair are growing. The United States has learned that there are limits to our ability to end conflict and correct economic ills, but we injure our own interests if we simply turn our backs on the problems of others.

Our enemies portray us as capitalistic exploiters whose only goal is the maximization of profits. The misinformed poor often accept this image and demand that their leaders be anti-American. We cannot "buy" the masses with foreign assistance, nor should we attempt to do so, but it is clear that much more of our aid must reach the most needy, quite aside from any desire for gratitude from the poor. The Congress has mandated changes in emphasis from large capital development programs to people-oriented assistance, and AID is well-advanced in its reorganization to achieve these changes. The termination of the foreign aid program at this juncture would serve only to convince the poor and war-weary that we are interested only in hanging on to our present wealth as the Western world disintegrates.

I know how difficult it is to respond to the public outcry against spending dollars abroad when we are faced with grave economic problems at home. I am reminded that when the nations of the world were turned inward in the 1930's with problems far worse than those we face today, before long they were at one another's throats. In the much smaller and more interdependent world of today I fear that isolation would breed hatred even more quickly. And the weapons we now possess would bring total destruction.

With foreign assistance we cannot purchase security but we cannot help but contribute to the collapse of international cooperation if we discontinue the program now.

Some of us have serious reservations about massive assistance to South Vietnam, South Korea, and Cambodia. While I will support the amendment setting a limit on funds to Cambodia, I do think we must consider the alternatives to elimination of this assistance. There is no question that the drain on our resources is considerable. There is also no question that the policies and practices of some of these governments are open to charges that they violate democratic principles and even our sense of morality. Nevertheless we cannot dictate morality and we have learned the hard way that democracy cannot be imposed upon a people. We must keep foremost in any debate our own national interest—deal with governments as they exist with appropriate encouragement of

democracy and justice, but defend our interests whenever and however we must.

It is altogether correct and proper that we debate carefully specific items in this bill, reviewing types and amounts of assistance to particular countries where there is controversy. What is essential is that we face up to our responsibilities and opportunities by continuing the program. I would like to see a return to bipartisanship in foreign affairs. There is a great need for openness and candor on the part of the administration in this respect. The "style" of the Departments of State and Defense in articulating and defending foreign policy must be improved. They must seek dialog not only with the great powers but also with the greatest power—the American people and their elected representatives.

Finally I note that there is a call for an immediate cutoff of military aid to Turkey. I share with the proponents of the amendment a sense of outrage that American equipment is being used to perpetuate the illegal military occupation of northern Cyprus. At the same time I ask myself what the sponsors of the cutoff hope to achieve by this measure. If they seek to simply punish the Turks in the hope that they will refrain from attacking additional islands, then I believe the measure would succeed. If, on the other hand, my respected colleagues hope to obtain the evacuation of Turkish forces from the island, then I fear the amendment is hopelessly misguided. History leads me to believe that Turkey will become even more determined to hang on to northern Cyprus—even at the cost of denuding her northern frontier with the Soviet Union. The importance of Turkey to the NATO alliance need not be recounted. I question the wisdom of risking the alienation of a valuable ally with a punishment that however justifiable will do nothing to solve the problem of Cyprus. I urge that the Turks be given time to form a government that can negotiate a withdrawal of troops.

Tensions are rising throughout the world as food and energy become ever scarcer. If we turn inward and reject the idea of foreign aid it is likely that where war now smolders it will explode, and where the poor are forgotten they will turn their faces forever from us. Our children will live to regret our short-sightedness long after our economic problems are back under control.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to strike all economic aid to Turkey until such time as they comply with the international efforts to control drugs. As most of the Members know, it has not been that many years ago that our drug enforcement administration had been able to determine that 80 percent of the heroin that was floated on the streets and towns of our United States found its

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11541

origin in Turkey. As a result of the unconditional ban that was placed in 1972 on the growth of opium in Turkey we have been able to find, not only in our cities and States, but certainly in the drug enforcement administration, that there was a drastic cut in the quality and quantity of the drugs that were made available.

Some Members of this House, including my dear colleague from New York, LESTER WOLFF, heard rumor that the Turkish Government intended to resume the growth of poppies and we had reason to believe that the Turkish Government was concerned about the economic plight of the farmers, who represent 1 percent of the entire population of Turkey, and it was indicated that they were suffering such an economic loss as a result of this ban.

We went to Turkey and talked to the experts in our Department of State and Foreign Service, and we were able to find out it was not the farmers who were concerned about the ban but several political bodies in Turkey and we found out that, except as it relates to asking for American money, the political structure in Turkey wanted no part of the United States and certainly felt that the ban was imposed as a result of President Nixon's influence on that military government.

It seems to me that year after year, until it has now reached the billions of dollars, the Turkish Government can reject those parts of my argument as we ask them to assist us in preventing the poison from coming to the United States and yet they cannot understand that plight to such an extent that they might make some small sacrifice, as this Congress has appropriated some \$36 million to assist them to provide some crop substitute, some type of assistance to make certain there would be no economic or cultural heavy weight on the farmer.

But, nevertheless, notwithstanding all threats to cut off aid, the Turkish Government indicated unilaterally they were going to resume the growing of opium, and now we find one of the most terrible frauds that have been committed on the U.S. Congress, that they were doing this with the United Nations lauding them for their effort because they said they would use a straw process, a process that would prevent the farmer from lancing the bulb and scraping off the opium sap, when there is no one in our State Department and no one in the United Nations, and certainly no one in Turkey, no one in our Government or their government, who knows where they are going to sell the straw or whether or not the United Nations intends to police the illegal growing of opium. They are talking about a \$1 million, \$2 million, \$10 million alkali plant. There is no such plant in Turkey. They are saying to the United States that, once they start growing, we will have the financial responsibility not only to police the growth but to provide them with the funds to get the plant.

We are going to end up with the situation that we are darned if we do and darned if we don't, because what it means is that once they start growing

opium, they are going to ask us to assume the responsibility for a diversion.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has seen fit to unanimously pass a resolution to cut off all assistance to Turkey until such time as they comply with our Foreign Assistance Act in controlling the international trafficking in drugs.

The President of the United States has not seen fit to suspend aid. The Drug Enforcement Administration says it is an impossible situation for us or for the Turkish Government to police, because there are some 80,000 farmers there and these farms only grow a small percentage of opium, which means they would have to cover up to 3,000 villages to police them in order to see whether or not they are growing illegal opium.

If we have any concern about our men in the Armed Forces who were stricken so hard by the opium crisis and if we have any concern about our inner cities and our suburban areas, I think it is time for the U.S. Congress to show that we mean business, and that we are not going to cut off assistance for all purposes, but we will just cut off this assistance until the President of the United States believes there is a goodfaith effort on their part to comply with the international sanctions against those who grow these drugs.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

(Mr. BIESTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17234, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, with a deep sense of concern and urgency for the programs authorized in this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor.

The major features of this bill have already been touched upon. We are, through the authorization of funds, attempting to help stabilize the political and military situation in the Middle East, scaling down funds to Indochina, emphasizing the importance of universal human rights, restricting the unauthorized activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, and increasing the emphasis on agricultural and nutritional assistance to the poorer nations. Furthermore, we are following through in implementing the reforms made in last year's foreign assistance legislation which restructured the thrust of our aid program to focus on basic and endemic needs of the less developed countries. In total, \$2.64 billion is authorized in appropriations for fiscal year 1975.

The committee bill is a carefully worked piece of legislation based on the request submitted by the administration with our close attention to domestic considerations and international obligations. We have taken heed to balance the demands imposed upon us by present economic circumstances with the responsible course we feel our Nation must follow in its relations with other countries.

We have a weighty obligation here at home to reorder our national priorities away from excessive military spending

toward human needs. Likewise, I feel we should allocate those resources earmarked for international purposes toward programs directed at helping less developed nations with fundamental projects in agriculture, health, and education. The legislation before us does reduce authorizations below what was requested by the administration for military assistance and foreign military credit sales. This amount undoubtedly would have been cut to a much lower level had not the U.S. commitment to the resolution of the conflict in the Middle East called for additional American economic and military support to both Israel and the Arab countries. There will be efforts to further reduce certain other military assistance authorizations, such as those to South Korea, which can bring down our overall outlay in the military sphere to an even more reasonable level. This can be accomplished while still providing a military aid program adequate for defense purposes.

I am pleased that the Foreign Affairs Committee saw fit to adopt an amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM and me increasing by \$20 million funds for population growth and family planning programs. While I believe such an expenditure is essential if we expect to make progress in raising living standards in the LDC's, I feel these efforts will get nowhere unless they are accompanied by significant advances in health, agricultural production and increased protein consumption in the poorer nations. The authorization in this bill of \$180.3 million for food and nutrition programs along with the \$291 million already authorized for similar purposes takes us in the direction we need to go in addressing the question of how we can make more food available to those who need it most.

When we examine the state of the world economy today, we can readily see how the nations of the world community have become more dependent upon one another for the resolution of mutually shared problems. The need for even more cooperation is imperative. This growing interdependence has been accompanied by a healthy openness in multi- and international relations and trade. There is no assurance, however, that such a situation will continue and progress, especially if the United States fails to provide the participation and leadership which is so essential in maintaining such a climate. At present, as we are experiencing economic difficulties of such serious proportions, there is a considerable temptation to turn inward for solutions without adequate regard for international factors and the international ramifications of our national policies. Some would eliminate or dangerously scale down our foreign assistance efforts in order to concentrate on domestic priorities. Without slighting the extreme importance of formulating a forceful program on the domestic front to combat inflation and recession, our thinking cannot be parochial. The economic predicament in which we find ourselves is unlike any which has preceded it. It is a truly global problem

H 11542

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 10, 1974

with every nation—rich and poor alike—inescapably locked in with one another. The impulse must be dismissed which suggests that looking inward, to the neglect of international relationships, will resolve our economic difficulties. Rather, we must follow a policy which recognizes the importance the prudent allocation of foreign assistance funds can take in helping stabilize national economies which, in turn, can bring back a greater semblance of order to the overall world economic picture.

We have an undeniably critical stake in the future of the developing nations. Apart from the obvious importance of their political posture in relation to the major power blocs, they are a vital economic factor as well. Even the smallest nations possess strategic raw materials which are in short supply and high demand by the industrialized countries, and the significance of all nations in the global trading picture is becoming more and more apparent. It has been projected that within 10 years we will be dependent upon imports for 96 percent of our aluminum, 34 percent of copper, and 100 percent manganese and tin to indicate only a few of the principal raw materials essential to our economy and security which we must secure from others. In 1972 the LDC's represented an almost \$15 billion market for U.S. goods and services, and since they buy more from us than we do from them they are a positive contributor to our balance of payments.

Experience should have been the best teacher in making clear the fact that our foreign assistance program does not buy friendship abroad. There is no guarantee that recipients of our aid will behave as we think they should, either internally or in their relations with others. It is wrong to think of aid in these terms. We can be hopeful it will have an influence in our favor, but we should not be surprised when it does not. What we can hope to achieve through the various assistance undertakings, embodied in this legislation and other measures comprising our aid program, is an improved climate for working on and working out the many complex issues which directly and indirectly involve and affect us all. Restraint in budgetary considerations is a commendable characteristic when applied to foreign assistance as well as expenditures in all other Federal categories. But we should not allow our eagerness to make budgetary cuts obscure the rationale of our assistance efforts, the intricacies of their operation and the far-reaching value they can have. As we take care to make the right decisions during this unsettling period in our economic life, we should not lose sight of the importance international considerations will play in working toward economic stability and an improved atmosphere of political understanding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out two things: First,

that we are in an unusual session—I think we all recognize that—and a bill that is automatically explosive suffers the unusual possibilities of being misunderstood and misinterpreted merely because of the atmosphere of the day.

Second, I would point out to the gentleman who preceded me in the well, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), that I was one of the original cosponsors of the resolution calling for a cutoff of aid to Turkey if the agreement to cut off Turkish opium production was not maintained.

We are now at the stage of saying to the President: "Unless the Turkish Government proves to us and proves to your satisfaction that this opium-production is controlled, you may not provide them with any aid."

Mr. Chairman, the problem is that there is nothing but a caretaker Turkish Government, and under these conditions those of us who are familiar with parliamentary structures realize we just cannot negotiate with caretaker governments. The same logic, frankly, would apply to the present Government of Italy. The Government of Turkey falls in that category. Perhaps the new Government of Greece, which is just reestablishing itself, falls in that category, as well as a number of other parliamentary democracies in the world which are going through caretaker government. They are paralyzed by the very nature of that structure.

I am not making an argument at this point for letting the Turks off the hook. I am merely pointing out that we may be asking the impossible, and that they may not have a government that can make any decision. I think it is especially important that we keep that in mind so we do not find ourselves in a position that is impractical and illogical and that would cause us to miss our ultimate goal.

Mr. Chairman, my dear colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) was suggesting, as I understand it, is that this program is in such disfavor that we must turn to all sorts of multilateral programs.

Well, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) knows, whenever a program is in disfavor, we change the name of the agency. So I suppose if we come up with a name such as "Self-Help for Hard Pressed American Industry Agency" or something like that, the program will survive. It has happened enough in the past so I am not really being facetious.

The gentleman from Illinois should keep in mind that multinational programs are also under attack. U.N. agencies, which are the normal ones we might wish to utilize, will be under attack because of the recent deplorable action of the United Nations General Assembly permitting spokesmen of the PLO to utilize the General Assembly session and have similar recognition in specialized United Nations agencies.

• So we cannot even use the more practical outlets for U.S. aid if we wanted to switch from a bilateral program.

I think it would be proper in the last 2 weeks of a historic Congress if we would demonstrate diplomatic understanding. If we would give the President and the

Secretary of State some necessary time to deal with a few ticklish problems with respect to one or two governments that may be totally incapable of adjusting to the pressures and demands of this time at this point, the next Congress would, of course, exercise necessary legislative oversight.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON).

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17234, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974.

This bill is an unusually important piece of legislation in several respects. In addition to cutting the administration's request by over \$600 million, this bill tightens legislative loopholes, restricts the Government's ability to use funds for purposes other than those intended by Congress, authorizes reduced but adequate funds for Vietnam, reduces substantially grant military aid, and preserves increased funds for food and institution aid to help developing states improve the performance of the agricultural sectors.

This bill also supports several important foreign policy objectives of the United States in the Middle East and South Asia region. First, the bill is intricately tied to and supportive of the U.S. peace initiative to try to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict and bring a lasting peace to the war-torn Middle East. Second, the bill seeks to promote development aid programs designed to increase agricultural production in the poor and near-starvation states of South Asia. Third, the bill is supportive of several general foreign policy objectives including the Nixon doctrine and helping others help and defend themselves. Fourth, the bill is realistic and seeks, in the funds made available for the states of the Middle East and South Asia, to supplement and complement the aid programs and financial support of other states rather than supplant and duplicate other initiatives.

MIDDLE EAST PACKAGE

The most important portion of this foreign aid bill as it relates to the Near East and South Asia region is the new part VI, better known as the Middle East package.

This section authorizes \$250 million in security supporting assistance for Israel and Egypt and \$77.5 million in security supporting assistance for Jordan. On the military side, the bill earmarks \$100 million in military grants and \$200 million in military credits for Israel and approximately \$95 million in grant military aid for Jordan.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are sizable because of our strong commitment to peace in the Middle East and the high degree of prestige and personal stakes that our Government has put on the line for the cause of a just Middle East settlement. I remained convinced that the Middle East section came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with one underlying theme: We commend the United States for its considerable efforts

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11543

for the cause of peace in the Middle East and we support those efforts. I hope that this body reiterates that pledge with its actions on this bill.

ISRAEL

The costs of the October 1973 war and continued partial mobilization, in addition to its serious inflation, have put serious economic dilemmas before the Israeli Government. The request of security supporting assistance for Israel is designed to help directly with Israel's budget and economic crisis and to provide that friendly government with a degree of economic strength and stability at a time when it faces important dilemmas in peace negotiations involving potential risks.

The total \$300 million of military aid support being made available to Israel corresponds to the amount available last year in the regular fiscal year 1974 budget. Although Israel received some \$2.2 billion in the Emergency Assistance Act of 1973 following the October 1973 war, the resupply effort and Israel's changing defense requirements are putting new pressures on its military establishment and are requiring new types of defensive equipment to protect Israel within changing frontiers. These funds remain crucial to providing for Israel's strength and to enabling Israel to participate in peace talks without jeopardizing its security.

EGYPT

The security supporting assistance for Egypt is also an important part of this bill and directly related to the crucial support the Egyptian Government has been giving to Secretary Kissinger's diplomatic initiatives in the region. President Sadat has been a key figure in the Middle East in the last year and his country is the most important Arab state in the area. Several times in the last year President Sadat has gone that extra distance to help us in our efforts. Several times he has put his prestige on the line for the cause of a lasting peace and for causes which may have initially been less popular in other parts of the Arab world.

The changes in Egyptian policy displayed during the last year and Egyptian support for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict are encouraging signs. Under the surface, there exists in Egypt today an increased desire to want to get on with economic and social development and to find honorable ways of reaching a lasting peace with Israel. The Egyptian economy has been hit hard by years of war and neglect. The cities along the once-important Suez Canal have been leveled by years of cycles of hot, and then sporadic, warfare.

The economic aid being made available for Egypt in this bill is designed to strengthen the forces of moderation in the Middle East and give the people of that important country an alternative to further conflict by showing what can be done in a peaceful environment to improve the quality of life and restore the badly damaged regions of Egypt along the Suez Canal.

We are not participating in this effort alone. States of Europe, Japan and, more

importantly, some of the oil-rich state of the Persian Gulf are committing billions of dollars to the rebuilding of the Egyptian economy. Our efforts are designed to complement these other, larger international efforts.

The money requested in this bill will provide American technical assistance both for opening of the Suez Canal and for helping restore basic utilities to the cities along the Suez Canal so that the civilian populations that once lived there will return to some semblance of a normal life. This commitment is one to peace and returning the Suez Canal region to normalcy. It is a fruitful way of trying to consolidate initial steps toward peace and insuring that what has been accomplished can be preserved in the coming months, and perhaps years, of negotiations that may lie ahead.

JORDAN

U.S. assistance to and support of the Government of Jordan and the policies of its leader, King Hussein, are also an important part of the Middle East package. The bill provides for some \$94.2 million in grant military aid, \$30 million in military credits, and some \$77.5 million in economic security supporting assistance. Jordan has been supportive of the United States and stood by our initiatives and our policies in the Middle East for many years.

Jordan has a small and efficient army that needs some modern equipment to defend itself against neighbors who receive substantial and sophisticated equipment from the Soviet Union. Jordan has also an economy that is moving toward self-sufficiency. Our aid is designed to improve its small army and to inject some money into its economy to spur further economic development. The Jordanian economy has come a long way since the days of the civil war in 1970 which left that state in a shambles. The United States should continue to support current trends in that state.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FUND

The Middle East section of the bill also contains a \$100 million special requirements fund which is more closely related to Secretary Kissinger's diplomacy for peace and to our efforts to encourage peaceful attitudes and development where possible and where consistent with the larger foreign policy goals of this country.

Although none of the funds made available in this section are to be used until after Congress receives notification and has an opportunity to disapprove possible allocation by concurrent resolution, we do have some indication of how this money might be used. First, we know it will all be used for economic development purposes. Second, Secretary Kissinger has said in testimony that some portion of it may be used in Syria to help rebuild the Qunietra region near the Golan Heights. Third, up to \$6 million will be available to help supplement the United Nations Relief and Works Agency's regular budget which has a huge deficit and permit it to continue to provide minimum levels of humanitarian aid to needy refugees. Without supplemental support from the United States

and other countries, UNRWA will have to curtail vital services. And, finally, the committee report urges that some of the funds might profitably be used to help support some of the existing educational and vocational training institutions on the West Bank and in Gaza.

All of these uses represent important investments in peace and I believe that it is important for the United States to maintain considerable flexibility over these funds even though we must retain the provision stating that the State Department must return to Congress to indicate how these funds might be allocated.

OTHER PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE MIDDLE EAST

In addition to more regular, annual foreign aid sections which have traditionally helped people in the Middle East including support of educational institutions in Israel, Lebanon, and Egypt under the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad program and of Palestinian refugees under the UNRWA United Nations program, this bill contains four other important and new policy statements on the Middle East which deserve particular mention here.

First, section 620(p) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is repealed. This section prohibited aid to Egypt unless it was determined to be in the national interest of the United States. As a sign of the improved relations between the United States and Egypt, this section is no longer necessary. Such negative statements in this bill are replaced by positive expressions that we hope United States-Egyptian relations will continue to improve and that Egypt's desire for a peaceful settlement and a lasting peace will continue to be a cornerstone of its foreign policies.

Second, in a statement of policy the bill expresses the sense of the Congress that "none of the funds authorized by this act should be provided to any nation which denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate." The major impetus behind the inclusion of this statement is the continued poor condition of the dwindling Jewish community of Syria. The more than 3,000 Syrian Jews still living in that country lead very restricted lives and seem to be denied both gainful employment and the right to emigrate. We must hope that within the context of improved relations with Syria that this community will not remain a hopeless pawn but will be given the free choice of leaving or remaining in Syria. If that choice is not offered, any potential offer of aid to Syria would be in serious trouble.

Third, the bill stipulates that none of the funds authorized can be used to finance any equipment or technology promised pursuant to any agreement for nuclear cooperation that might be signed between the United States and Egypt or Israel. With all the problems and tensions involved in the Middle East situation, it would seem that there are several more constructive channels for our energies and limited financial resources which do not present the potential, grave risks of the exchange of nuclear technology with two states which have not signed the Nu-

H 11544

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 10, 1974

clear Nonproliferation Treaty and two states which have been involved in hostilities so often and so recently.

A fourth item in the foreign aid bill, which conceivably might have relevance for the Middle East, is the new section 659 on reimbursable development programs. This section makes available up to \$2 million to assist the United States in working with friendly states who do not receive development aid. The purpose of this section is to promote American technology and expertise in states where governments will and can pay for technical assistance but where in the absence of small amounts of funds to "top off" salaries and expenses of American experts, the Americans could not get the valuable contracts. This section will help make us more competitive in distant countries and facilitate open and fair access to natural resources of interest to us.

SOUTH ASIA

In South Asia, the foreign aid bill supports very different, but nonetheless important, foreign policy goals. The bill authorizes close to \$235 million, mostly in development loans, for the States of South Asia. The bill support programs for—in descending order of funds made available—Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, and Nepal. There is also a small program for the Yemen Arab Republic requested.

Last year Congress authorized roughly the same amount for these states. Our efforts in South Asia relate primarily to improving their agricultural production and their ability to feed themselves. This is no small task in an area which is continually faced with food shortages, alternately droughts, floods, and cyclones and occasionally bureaucracies that cannot properly administer programs.

Let me give one example of the kind of thing our aid will seek to do, namely, build up a domestic fertilizer capacity in these countries. One ton of nutrient fertilizer, for example, will have a multiplier effect in South Asia over twice the effect than if that fertilizer were used in this country. From an economic viewpoint, it is far more practical to help provide the States of South Asia with the equipment and material necessary to increase its domestic fertilizer production than it is to ship food from the United States. We should be moving in this direction with our aid. The potential exists and this makes these development loans all the more important. Unfortunately, for the short run, most of these states will need both economic aid for the future and food aid for the present.

Inflation, the fourfold increase in oil prices and the vagaries of the weather have added several strains in the economies of all states in South Asia. Other aid donors are responding to these added burdens from countries whose cumulative populations represent a sizable portion of humanity. It is important for the United States to work, as best we can with the limited aid funds available, with the World Bank-led aid consortia for these states and provide the material and technical assistance to promote development in, perhaps, the poorest re-

gion in the world. The aid funds authorized here are modest compared to years and decades past, but the funds are targeted for areas and projects where they will bring the greatest and quickest results and will help the poor.

Particular mention should be made of the \$50 million in aid being made available for India. While this amount was limited by the committee, it does reflect the improved nature of United States-Indian relations and our desire for establishing a better dialog on all issues of mutual concern. India is the largest state in South Asia and while our aid programs there will likely never again reach the high levels they once were, we do have an interest in working with India in trying to solve some of its serious economic problems, particularly in the agricultural sector. Our legitimate concern over India's nuclear program should not prevent us from working with that state to try to solve the problems of poverty. This bill supports the idea of a modest increase in our aid programs to India, a program which was reduced to almost nothing during the last 2 years when relations were strained.

These South Asian country programs are complemented by small, ongoing special projects such as the Indus River Basin project which is nearing completion and which will receive \$14.7 million in this bill, and regional manpower and health educational programs. Some of these technical assistance efforts involve CENTO countries and others involve sending South Asia students to regional institutions like the American University of Beirut for specialized training. Such regional programs are replacing programs that would bring students to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 offers in several important respects, a new and challenging set of concepts in foreign aid and supports many significant foreign policy goals of this Nation. There were significant attempts made in the drafting of this bill to show strong support for U.S. peace initiatives in the Middle East, reduce overall amounts, cut unnecessary grant military aid programs to states which do not face serious external threats, incorporate a recognition of a growing concern in Congress for the human rights of all peoples around the world, especially those in states which continue to receive substantial U.S. aid and put greater emphasis on economic aid in general and agricultural and population aid in particular.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. If we shirk our responsibility on this crucial matter, we are voting "no" for peace and stability in many regions around the world where we do have short- and long-term interests to preserve and promote.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to commend the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee,

Dr. MORGAN, for the able leadership he has provided over many months in bringing a foreign aid bill to the House floor.

His task has not been an easy one. There were many contentious and difficult issues with which the committee was forced to contend in marking up this legislation.

Because of Chairman MORGAN's ability at conciliation and negotiation, this bill represents a compromise—in the very best sense of that word.

Through 12 days of hearings and 15 days of open markup session, the committee has labored hard to shape legislation which will meet the concerns of a majority of the House of Representatives.

The legislation will not, of course, please everyone. There are, indeed, provisions which I myself opposed in committee and which I wish were not in the bill. Taken in its totality, however the bill is a good one and deserves the support of this body.

Therefore, I hope my colleagues will study the bill and the committee report carefully. If there is to be a foreign aid bill this year, it cannot be weighed down with controversial amendments, which either will make a conference with the Senate difficult or invite a Presidential veto.

I need not caution that we are nearing the end of a particularly exhausting—but productive—Congress. In a few short months we will begin consideration of a foreign assistance bill for the next fiscal year. If Members who have amendments could withhold them until then, I am sure they will find the Committee on Foreign Affairs receptive to working with them of implementing their ideas.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 25 years I have annually worked for passage of a foreign aid bill. More than any other time in my experience, passage of the aid bill this year is essential to the future success of American foreign policy—and to world peace.

THE MIDDLE EAST PACKAGE

All of us have been pleased by the diplomatic efforts of our Secretary of State and his colleagues to begin the job of defusing tensions in the Middle East, following the October war of 1973.

Let me briefly review the situation at the end of that war:

First, the Arab nations had become convinced that the United States had wholly sided with Israel and that Arab and American objectives could not be reconciled;

Second, relations with Europe and Japan were strained because of the oil boycott and differences over reaching a settlement in the Middle East;

Third, the Soviet Union had emerged as the Arab's apparent best friend and protector and had gained a strong political position on the Middle East;

Fourth, Israel, having suffered significant losses, faced an extremely uncertain future; and

Fifth, here at home we all were waiting in long, long lines to get gasoline.

As a result of diplomatic initiatives in which our Nation took a leading role, and because of the willingness of certain Arab leaders to accept a central role of the

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11545

United States in settling the dispute, hopeful steps have been taken toward an ultimate solution.

Foreign aid to some of the nations involved in the Middle East is an important element in holding the present situation together. It will not insure an agreement in the Middle East, but will help greatly to advance our diplomatic efforts.

The bill earmarks \$100 million in military grant aid for Israel; \$250 million each to Israel and Egypt for security supporting assistance; and \$200 million in military credit sales to Israel. In addition, it creates a special requirements fund of \$100 million for Middle East use.

Should this bill be defeated and there be no "Middle East package" of aid, the chance for a lasting peace in that region would be considerably jeopardized.

I need not remind my colleagues of the potential costs of renewed fighting in the Middle East. By providing foreign aid to countries in that area we are helping to insure against future outbreaks.

INDOCHINA AID

A similar peace-related situation exists with respect to Indochina aid.

In Laos—we have attained a cease-fire and a coalition government that has shown some indications of progress.

In Vietnam, the situation currently is one of greatly reduced military activity which has permitted the people of South Vietnam to turn from war to rebuilding their country.

In a sense the conflict with the north has entered a new stage: A battle for the economy of South Vietnam. Barring intensified conflict, there is reason to be confident that the people of the south can achieve increased economic development.

For example, this year Vietnam will once again be self-sufficient in rice because harvests have been good in the Mekong Delta area, next year Vietnam may earn foreign exchange from rice exports—as it did before the Indochina war.

In order to sustain South Vietnam's efforts at reconstruction and development—and ultimately to win the economic war with the north—it is necessary to continue substantial amounts of foreign aid in the form of supporting assistance.

Nevertheless, the committee in its deliberations on this item already has cut the funding request by some \$340 million—from \$750 million asked by the executive branch, to \$405 million currently programmed.

Any further cuts—or defeat of this bill—would severely jeopardize chances for an end to the conflict in Southeast Asia. It would be an open invitation to Hanoi to attack the south. The United States would then be faced with the dilemma of making an appropriate response.

SOUTH KOREA

I believe the funds in this bill are also important to the cause of peace in Korea. It is common knowledge that an attempt will be made today to cut those funds drastically.

Such a move would, in my estimation, be tragically shortsighted.

Granted that none of us is attracted to the government of President Park. It has been harsh and repressive in many instances.

But it would be folly to so reduce our military aid to South Korea to the point that North Korea would be emboldened to attack or to undertake other kinds of actions which would threaten peace in the Korean Peninsula.

Need we remind ourselves that the Government of North Korea is generally considered among the most repressive in the world. Where would we gain by cutting our aid? How would the cause of human rights be advanced if war ensues?

This bill contains about \$185 million for military aid to Korea. The entire amount is needed. Attempts to reduce the figure should be turned back.

In Cambodia, of course, there is no peace. But the cause of achieving peace will not, I contend, be served by failing to provide needed assistance to the Cambodian people. If there is to be a negotiated settlement and true peace—as opposed to a bloodbath and the peace of the dead—the United States must continue to meet its responsibilities to bolster the Khmer Republic through providing economic and military aid.

How ironic it would be if this body took action prejudicial to Cambodia at the very time that the government's legitimacy had been reaffirmed at the United Nations.

INCREASING WORLD FOOD PRODUCTION

Just as passage of this bill is important to peace in the Middle East, Indochina, and Korea, it is also, in the long run, very significant in the effort to remedy such causes of world unrest and conflict as starvation, disease, ignorance, and poverty.

It was my privilege last month to head the delegation from the House which attended the World Food Conference in Rome. Although my reactions to that event were mixed, one conclusion emerged clearly:

There is a world food shortage which must be addressed by all the world's nations if we are to avoid a breakdown of order in many countries—a breakdown which could imperil international stability.

In recognition of world food shortages, the committee has authorized \$180.3 million in additional funds for food and nutrition. This amount, which is \$75 million less than the administration's request but which increases the current authorization, provides a total of \$471.3 million for food and nutrition projects in fiscal year 1975.

The answer to starvation must be increased production in the food-short countries themselves. The United States no longer has sufficient food supplies to feed the world.

The funds in this bill will be used to help the developing world increase its own agricultural output, particularly to bring small farmers—who are in the vast majority—into the economic mainstream.

In enacting the "new directions" in foreign aid represented by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, the Congress set

in motion an effort to reach the poor, rural majorities of the developing world and to assist them to grow more food.

That action was taken before the dimensions of the current world food shortage were known. Today the wisdom of congressional action last year is readily apparent. But we must intensify our efforts this year with additional funding, as provided in this legislation.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I commend this bill to my colleagues and urge their approval.

With peace as our goal—peace in the Middle East, peace in Indochina, world peace—let us vote to provide the funds necessary to conduct effective foreign assistance programs in fiscal year 1975.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

(Mr. DENNIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I am persuaded that the issues in this bill are important and that this is one of those occasions, always difficult for this House, when we ought to make the effort to employ politics in the higher meaning of statecraft rather than in its more familiar aspect of counting noses in the precincts.

I am no great and good friend of foreign aid and there are aspects of the bill now before us which fail to arouse any great enthusiasm in me. There are Members of this body, such as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), who are always and forever and without exception against foreign aid in any amount and under any circumstances and in all its forms. These gentlemen have their considered reasons for their point of view, they are consistent, and I respect them and their position.

I am not myself of this school, but neither am I a big spender by nature or belief at home or abroad. I consider foreign aid legitimate, not when employed as a scattergun discharging alleged general good will but when, and only when, employed as a sharpshooter's rifle, aimed and targeted at some specific foreign policy advantage for the clear benefit of this great Nation and its great and patient common people whom we represent, and who pay the taxes and who foot the bill.

There is another type of Member in this body with whom I find myself in complete and total disagreement on this particular subject. Unlike my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), they are not always opposed to foreign aid for economic, financial, and nationalistic American reasons. Somewhat like myself, although they favor aid more generally than I do, they are sometimes for aid and sometimes opposed to aid; but these people, to my way of thinking, are governed in their viewpoint less by American national interest than by their view of the advancement of social goals and political and economic policies as they see them from their own somewhat doctrinaire point of view. These are the people who do not want to buy

chrome from Rhodesia even though we need Rhodesian chrome. They are the people who do not want to aid Chile or South Korea or South Vietnam or Cambodia or the former Government of Portugal, not on the basis of our own national interest in these cases but because these are dictatorial governments and, more significantly, because they are dictatorial governments of the right.

These people, most of them, are willing to help Israel even to the extent of denuding the United States of vital military equipment. Yet they tend to boggle at the extension of some moderate aid to Egypt or to Jordan or, under some circumstances, perhaps to Syria, as a necessary means of maintaining a balance which prudence would suggest is absolutely essential to the maintenance of peace. And so far as I know, these people have made no serious effort in the last 20 years to attempt to use the leverage which we have with Israel to try to make a settlement of the exceedingly difficult and now terribly and unnecessarily exacerbated problem of the Palestinian refugees.

Again some of these same people say that Turkey is a military aggressor—forgetting, it appears, that the crisis was precipitated by a rightwing dictatorship in Greece—and that, therefore, we must second-guess the Secretary of State and the President of the United States as to the best method of bringing about peace in the embattled island of Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, despite my many reservations about this bill, I am going to support it, if it is not loaded down by too many crippling amendments, as a needed and necessary tool of American foreign policy; but I strongly object to the double standard with which too many of us approach these vital problems. I implore my colleagues, in the name of world peace, to give the executive branch the necessary tools to do its constitutional job; and I beg them not to play politics on this floor with the fortunes and, it may be, even with the lives, of your constituents and mine.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a couple minutes at this time to inform the committee that when we arrive at the amending process of H.R. 17234, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, that I plan to offer an amendment. That amendment will do one thing. It will allow us, the United States, to barter with nations that want our foreign assistance. We today have our own problems within this country. We have a short supply of many strategic metals. We are using our natural resources and, as a matter of fact, we are using about 35 percent of the world's natural resources with only about 7 percent of the world's population. By the year 2000, on the basis of the known reserves that we have today in the United States, we will be out of 11 of our 13 major strategic metals.

The main purpose is to show that we can barter and have something coming

toward our shores for the foreign assistance that we give to the other nations.

Since 1946 we have allowed about \$158 billion to flow from our shores and it is time we received something back in turn, which will be the natural resources and the strategic metals that we so badly need in order to keep this industrialized Nation of ours rolling beyond the year 2000.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by titles.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1974".

TITLE I—MIDDLE EAST PEACE

ASSISTANCE TO THE MIDDLE EAST

SEC. 2. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART VI

"SEC. 901. STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress recognizes that a peaceful and lasting resolution of the divisive issues that have contributed to tension and conflict between nations in the Middle East is essential to the security of the United States and the cause of world peace. The Congress declares and finds that the United States can and should play a constructive role in securing a just and durable peace in the Middle East by facilitating increased understanding between the Arab nations and Israel, and by assisting the nations in the area in their efforts to achieve economic progress and political stability, which are the essential foundations for a just and durable peace. It is the sense of Congress that United States assistance programs in the Middle East should be designed to promote mutual respect and security among the nations in the area and to foster a climate conducive to increased economic development, thereby contributing to a community of free, secure, and prospering nations in the Middle East.

"It is further the sense of Congress that none of the funds authorized by the Act should be provided to any nation which denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate.

"SEC. 902. ALLOCATIONS.—(a) Of the funds appropriated to carry out chapter 3 of part II of this Act, during the fiscal year 1975 up to \$200,000,000 may be made available for military assistance in the Middle East, of which not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available for Israel.

"(b) Of the funds appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of this Act, during the fiscal year 1975 up to \$577,500,000 may be made available for security supporting assistance in the Middle East, of which not less than \$250,000,000 shall be made available for Israel and not less than \$250,000,000 shall be made available for Egypt.

"(c) Of the aggregate ceiling on credits and guaranties established by section 31(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, during the fiscal year 1975 up to \$230,000,000 shall be available for countries in the Middle East, of which not less than \$200,000,000 shall be made available for Israel.

"SEC. 903. (a) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FUND.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$100,000,000 to furnish assistance under part I of this Act to meet special requirements arising from time to time in carrying out the purposes of this part, in ad-

dition to funds otherwise available for such purposes. The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available for use by the President for assistance authorized by such part in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance. Such funds are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(b) The President may only obligate or expend, for each foreign country, or international organization, funds authorized under this section—

"(1) after he reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate concerning (A) the name of such foreign country or international organization, (B) the amount of such funds to be made available to such country or organization, and (C) the purpose for which such funds are to be made available to such country or organization; and

"(2) unless the Congress, within thirty legislative days after receiving any report under paragraph (1), adopts a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the provisions of the report provided by clauses (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1).

"(c) Of the amount authorized under subsection (a), not less than \$6,000,000 shall constitute a contribution by the United States toward the settlement of the deficit of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Middle East, if the President determines that a reasonable number of other countries will contribute a fair share toward the settlement of such deficit within a reasonable period of time after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974. In determining such fair share, the President shall take into consideration the economic position of each such country. Such \$6,000,000 shall be in addition to any other contribution to such Agency by the United States pursuant to any other provision of law."

PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE
SEC. 3. Section 620(p) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

SEC. 4. None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used to finance the construction of, the operation or maintenance of, or the supply of fuel for any nuclear powerplant in Israel or Egypt, which has been approved under an agreement for cooperation between the United States and either such country.

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McFALL, having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17234) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE TRADE BILL

(Mr. ADDABBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1